



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/556,830	04/21/2000	Scott A. Hollenbeck	6978.0075	6410

23838 7590 07/08/2003
KENYON & KENYON
1500 K STREET, N.W., SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHAU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/556,830

Applicant(s)

HOLLENBECK ET AL.

Examiner

Chau Nguyen

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-29 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3, 5-7, and 9-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broadhurst, Patent No. 6,560,634, and further in view of Farrow et al. (Farrow), Patent No. 6,374,295.

4. As to claim 1, Broadhurst discloses a method for use in a registration for processing a domain name registration operation in a shared registration system comprising the steps of:

generating a request for performing a domain name registration operation (col. 6, lines 44-67);

Art Unit: 2142

sending the request to a registry, wherein the registry is operable to receive the request (col.6, lines 44-67),

receiving a response to the request, the response indicating success or failure of the operation (col. 6, lines 15-26);

However, Broadhurst does not disclose authenticate a registrar that sent the request, determine whether the registrar is authorized to perform an action necessitated by the operation, execute the operation based on a determination that the registrar is authorized, and store changes necessitated by the operation in a database.

In the same field of endeavor, Farrow discloses the DNS servers 202A-N (registrar) must first login with the server manager 201 through a TCP link, and if the login process is successful, the servers 2002A-N must set their server id in able to issue command and requests to the server manager 201 for processing (col. 4, lines 18-62). Farrow also discloses the server manager 201 performs validations to the servers 202A-N, and so the servers can issue requests for configuration information from the central database (col. 4, line 63 – col. 5, line 59). Since Farrow teaches a method for managing IP addressing in a network communication between a central database and one or more servers (registrars) to register a domain name, which is similar to the method for requesting to register a domain name of Broadhurst, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Farrow and Broadhurst to include authenticate a registrar that sent the request, determine whether the registrar is authorized to perform an action

Art Unit: 2142

necessitated by the operation, execute the operation based on a determination that the registrar is authorized, and store changes necessitated by the operation in a database. Farrow suggests that servers 202A-N establish a link with the server manager 201 to issue requests for configuration information from the central database or send updated configuration information to the central database.

5. As to claim 3, Broadhurst and Farrow (Broadhurst-Farrow) disclose a method for use in a registry for processing a domain name registration operation in a shared registration system comprising the steps of:

receiving a request for performing a domain name registration operation (Broadhurst, col. 6, lines 44-67);

authenticating a registrar that sent the request (Farrow, col. 4, lines 18-62);

sending the request to an application server based on a determination that the registrar is authenticated, wherein the application server is operable to execute the operation (Farrow, col. 4, line 18 – col. 5, line 59);

receiving a response to the request, the response indicating success or failure of the operation (Farrow, col.6, lines 44-67); and

forwarding the response to the registrar.

6. As to claim 5, Broadhurst-Farrow disclose sending the registrar a response indicating failure of the operation based on a determination that the registrar is not authenticated (Farrow, col. 4, line 18 – col. 5, line 59).

7. As to claims 6, 20, 21, and 22, Broadhurst-Farrow disclose a method for use in a registry for processing a domain name registration operation in a shared registration system comprising the steps of:

receiving a request for performing a domain name registration operation (Broadhurst, col. 6, lines 44-67);

parsing the request (Broadhurst, col. 6, lines 10-26);

instantiating one or more objects, the objects corresponding to attributes included in the request (col. 6, lines 44-67);

determining whether a registrar that sent the request is authorized to perform an action necessitated by the operation (Farrow, col. 4, lines 18-62);

executing the operation based on a determination that the registrar is authorized;

storing changes necessitated by the operation in a database (Farrow, col. 4, line 18 – col. 5, line 59); and

sending a response to the registrar, the response indicating success or failure of the operation (Farrow, col. 4, line 18 – col. 5, line 59).

8. As to claim 7, Broadhurst-Farrow disclose determining whether the request is valid before the instantiating step (Broadhurst, col. 5, line 43 – col. 6, line 67).

9. As to claim 9, Broadhurst-Farrow disclose wherein the request includes a command name and an entity block (Broadhurst, col. 6, lines 44-67 and Fig. 6c).

10. As to claim 10, Broadhurst-Farrow disclose wherein the entity block includes an indication as to whether the operation pertains to a domain name or a name server (Broadhurst, col. 6, lines 44-67 and Fig. 6c).

11. As to claim 11, Broadhurst-Farrow disclose wherein the operation enables a registrar to register a domain name or a name server (Farrow, col. col. 4, line 18 – col. 5, line 59).

12. As to claim 12, Broadhurst-Farrow disclose wherein the operation enables a registrar to determine whether a domain name or name server has previously been registered (Broadhurst, col. 6, lines 15-37).

13. As to claim 13, Broadhurst-Farrow disclose wherein the operation enables a registrar to delete the registration of a domain name or delete a name server (Farrow, col. col. 4, line 18 – col. 5, line 59).

14. As to claim 14, Broadhurst-Farrow disclose wherein the operation enables a registrar to update a registered domain name or name server (Farrow, col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 22).

Art Unit: 2142

15. As to claim 15, Broadhurst-Farrow disclose wherein the operation enables a registrar to close a connection with the registry (Farrow, col. col. 4, line 18 – col. 5, line 59).

16. As to claim 16, Broadhurst-Farrow disclose wherein the operation enables a registrar to re-register a domain name (Farrow, col. col. 4, line 18 – col. 5, line 59).

17. As to claim 17, Broadhurst-Farrow disclose wherein the operation enables a registrar to authenticate a connection with the registry (Farrow, col. col. 4, line 18 – col. 5, line 59).

18. As to claim 18, Broadhurst-Farrow disclose wherein the operation allows a registrar to determine the current status of a domain name or name server (Farrow, col. col. 4, line 18 – col. 5, line 59).

19. As to claim 19, Broadhurst-Farrow disclose wherein the operation allows a registrar to request transfer of domain name sponsorship from a second registrar and to approve or reject transfer requests initiated by other registrars (Farrow, col. col. 4, line 18 – col. 5, line 59).

Art Unit: 2142

20. Claims 23-29 are corresponding apparatus and computer-readable medium claims containing similar limitations as discussed in claims 1, 3, and 6. Therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

21. Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broadhurst and Farrow as discussed in claims 1, 3, 5-7, and 9-29, and further in view of Win et al. (Win), Patent No. 6,182,142.

22. As to claim 2, Broadhurst and Farrow, however, do not disclose encrypting the request before the sending step. In the same field of endeavor, Win discloses Access server 106 (registrar) and Registry server 108 are coupled by an encrypted link 109, once the session is established, all data exchanged between them is encrypted (col. 22, line 30 – col. 23, line 40). Since Win teaches a system for controlling access to information resources, which is similar to the system of Broadhurst-Farrow, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Win and Broadhurst-Farrow to include encrypting the request before sending step for the purpose of network security and better performance.

23. As to claim 4, Broadhurst-Farrow and Win (Broadhurst-Farrow-Win) disclose decrypting the request before the authenticating step (inherent from Win, col. 22, line 30 – col. 23, line 40).

Art Unit: 2142

24. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broadhurst and Farrow as discussed in claims 1, 3, 5-7, and 9-29, and further in view of Hollenbeck et al. (Hollenbeck), RFC 2832.

25. As to claim 8, Broadhurst-Farrow, however, do not disclose wherein the request is a registry registrar protocol (RRP) request. In the same field of endeavor, Hollenbeck discloses Registry Registrar Protocol (RRP) developed by the Network Solutions, Inc. Registry under the auspices of the Shared Registration System program (page 3). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hollenbeck and Broadhurst-Farrow to include a Registry Registrar Protocol (RRP) to permit multiple registrars providing second level Internet domain name registration services in the top level domains (TLDs) administered by a TLD registry.

Art Unit: 2142

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-4639. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Mark Powell, can be reached at (703) 305-9703.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application is assigned are as follows:


(703) 746-7238 (After Final Communications only)

(703) 746-7239 (Official Communications)

(703) 746-7240(for Official Status Inquiries, Draft Communications only)

Inquiries of a general nature relating to the general status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Chau Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2142


MARK POWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Marc Thompson
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2142